

REMARKS

Claims 2-15 and 17-20 are all the claims presently pending in the application.

Applicant has not amended the claims by the present Request for Reconsideration.

Applicant gratefully acknowledges the Examiner's indication that **claims 6 and 20 are allowed**. However, Applicant respectfully submits that all of the claims (i.e., claims 2-15 and 17-20) should be allowable, for the reasons set forth below.

Claims 2-5, 7, 8, 10, and 17-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zhang et al. (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2003/0224830; hereinafter "Zhang") in view of Ranta (U.S. Pat. No. 6,751,485), and further in view of Fujiwara (JP 10-327233). Claims 9 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zhang in view of Ranta and Fujiwara, as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Paik et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,675,008; hereinafter "Paik").

Claims 11, and 13-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zhang in view of Ranta and Fujiwara, as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Mun et al. (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2003/0022659 hereinafter "Mun").

Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections in the following discussion.

I. THE CLAIMED INVENTION

Conventional portable telephone sets have been adapted to permit telephone calls by reading out a telephone number of the opposite side of communication registered in a telephone diary stored in a memory part based on the corresponding names or titles of the opposite side. Other conventional portable telephone sets include a camera part in which images of the faces of the opposite side of communication can be picked up by the camera part and is stored in the memory part

such that the face image is displayed on the display of the telephone set along with the opposite side data as name or telephone number.

In conventional portable telephone set communication systems, it is presently an indispensable convenient function to accumulate non-response call arrival having not been responded to so as to permit a non-response call arrival history based on these data to be displayed on the display as desired by the user operation.

However, the conventional portable telephone sets, such as disclosed by Zhang, have not disclosed or suggested displaying the image of the face or the like of the opposite side of communication in the case of utilizing the above-mentioned non-response call arrival history or stored messages.

The claimed invention, on the other hand, provides a portable communication terminal set which, like a portable telephone set or a PDA, which can display the image of the face or the like of the opposite side even in the case of utilizing non-response call arrival history or stored messages.

II. THE PRIOR ART REJECTIONS

A. **Claims 2-5, 7, 8, 10, and 17-19**

Claims 2-5, 7, 8, 10, and 17-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zhang in view of Ranta, and further in view of Fujiwara.

In the Office Action dated August 9, 2007 the Examiner concedes, “*Zhang et al, as modified by Ranta, fails to disclose wherein non-response call arrival history data concerning non-response call arrivals not responded in the radio part and priority order data defining the priority order of opposite side parties of communication are stored in the memory part under control by the control part, and in the initial stage of non-response call arrival check operation on the operation part, the image of image data among those stored in the memory part and*

corresponding to the opposite side party of communication of the highest priority order among the opposite side parties of communication among those corresponding to the non-response all arrival history data is displayed based on the non-response call arrival history data, priority order data and combination data stored in the memory part.” (See Office Action dated August 9, 2007 at page 6).

The Examiner, however, alleges that Fujiwara makes up the deficiencies of Zhang and Ranta. The Examiner, however, is clearly incorrect.

Applicants submit that the Examiner is clearly relying on a translation of Fujiwara to support his rejection. Indeed, the Examiner refers to several passages from the text of Fujiwara. The Examiner, however, has not provided the translation of Fujiwara to Applicant. If the Examiner wishes to maintain this rejection based on Fujiwara (which the Examiner cited in the present Office Action), the Examiner must provide Applicant with a translation of the reference.

Notwithstanding the above, Applicants submit that Fujiwara does not provide support for the Examiner’s allegations. Indeed, Fujiwara does not teach or suggest *“the image of image data among those stored in the memory part and corresponding to the opposite side party of communication of the highest priority order among the opposite side parties of communication among those corresponding to the non-response all arrival history data is displayed based on the non-response call arrival history data, priority order data and combination data stored in the memory part.”*

Indeed, Fujiwara merely teaches generating a list of missed telephone calls and arranging a partner’s telephone number in order of the time of day, which the call was received (e.g., see Fujiwara at paragraph [0024]). Indeed, the information is not

provided based on priority order data, only on the order that the phone calls were received.

Therefore, Fujiwara fails to make up the deficiencies of Zhang and Ranta. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

B. Claims 9 and 12:

Claims 9 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Zhang, Ranta, Fujiwara, and Paik.

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 9 and 12 are allowable for similar reasons to those set forth above with respect to claims 2-5, 7, 8, 10, and 17-19.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

C. Claims 11 and 13-15:

Claims 11 and 13-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Zhang, Ranta, Fujiwara, and Mun.

The Examiner alleges that the combination of Zhang, Ranta, and Mun disclose or suggest all of the features of the claimed invention.

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 11 and 13-15 are allowable for similar reasons to those set forth above with respect to claims 2-5, 7, 8, 10, and 17-19.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

III. CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that claims 2-15 and 17-20, all the claims presently pending in the application, are patentably distinct over the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to pass the above application to issue at the earliest possible time.

Should the Examiner find the application to be other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the local telephone number listed below to discuss any other changes deemed necessary in a telephonic or personal interview.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency in fees or to credit any overpayment in fees to Attorney's Deposit Account No. 50-0481.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: October 22, 2003



Scott M. Tulino, Esq.
Registration No. 48,317

Sean M. McGinn, Esq.
Registration No. 34,386

**MCGINN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
LAW GROUP, PLLC**
8321 Old Courthouse Road, Suite 200
Vienna, Virginia 22182-3817
(703) 761-4100
Customer No. 21254